

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated December 23, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 19, 21, 26 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0048050 (Kanematsu et al.). Claims 20, 22, 23, 27, 32 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al. in view of JP 07-129498 (Matsumoto et al.). Claims 24, 28, 34 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al. in view of Matsumoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,537 (Silva et al.). Claim 25, 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,899 (Coward). Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al. and Matsumoto et al. in view of Coward. Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al., Matsumoto et al. and Coward in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,211 (Dodd).

By the present response, Applicants have amended claims 19-21 and 37 to further clarify the invention. Claims 19-38 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 19, 21, 26 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kanematsu et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Kanematsu et al. discloses that when a job is executed in an image processing apparatus, a user is recognized by inputting a user ID from an operation unit. When the abnormality such as interferences with execution of the job occurs, data indicative of avoidance countermeasures for each user or each type of abnormality stored in a memory is referred to and the plural avoidance countermeasures are displayed sequentially from the one that is most frequently executed, and an optimum one is selected. After that, the frequency data for the selected avoidance countermeasure is renewed.

Regarding claims 19, 21 and 37, Applicants submit that Kanematsu et al. does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, sending a request of a processing which a first computer requests a second computer to perform and a first identifier of the processing to the second computer, generating by the second computer, a second identifier corresponding to the processing request received from the first computer and sending the second identifier to the first computer storing in the second computer the second identifier corresponding to the first identifier, processing status inquiry of inquiring a status of processing executed by another computer where when the first computer determines upon the inquiring that the second identifier corresponding to the processing has not been sent due to a failure, sending by the first computer the first identifier corresponding to the processing to the second computer, or when the second identifier corresponding to the said first identifier is stored in the second computer, sending by the second computer the second

identifier to the first computer and inquiring, by the first computer to the second computer of a status of the processing using the set second identifier.

The Examiner asserts that Kanematsu et al. discloses sending a request of a processing which a first computer requests a second computer to perform and a first identifier of the processing to the second computer, in paragraphs [0051], [0052] and [0054]. The Examiner further asserts that workstation 11 and image input/output control unit 3 in Kanematsu et al. correspond to Applicants' claimed first computer and second computer, respectively. However, the Examiner has misinterpreted the reference. Workstation 11 and control unit 3 are not discussed at all in paragraphs [0051], [0052] and [0054]. These paragraphs disclose a user registration process where a user inputs his name through an operation unit 115, and a CPU 114 retrieves the user name and determines whether the name has been registered or not, and it takes appropriate action based on this determination. Further, the user inputs his name through operation unit 114 prior to execution of a job in the image processing apparatus. Operation unit 115 and CPU 114 are both a part of reader unit 1 and are not a first computer and a second computer, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, the registration process disclosed in Kanematsu et al. is not sending a request of a processing which a first computer requests a second computer to perform. These portions of Kanematsu et al. merely disclose a user name registration process performed inside a reader unit.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Kanematsu et al. discloses generating by the second computer, a second identifier corresponding to the processing request

received from the first computer and sending the second identifier to the first computer by the paragraph [0059] and the job ID as the second identifier. However, again the Examiner has misapplied the reference. This portion of Kanematsu et al. discloses that the job ID and the user ID . . . are used to grasp and inquire the processing status. Therefore, along with the user ID, the job ID is used to inquire about the status. This is not generating by a second computer a second identifier corresponding to a processing request received from the first computer and sending the second identifier to the first computer, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner even admits that both identifiers are used to obtain status further down in his rejections.

In addition, the remaining assertions by the Examiners are similarly flawed. For example, the Examiner asserts that Kanematsu et al. discloses storing in the second computer the second identifier corresponding to the first identifier at paragraphs [0059] and [0064]. However, as noted previously, Kanematsu et al. does not disclose a second identifier corresponding to a first identifier where the second identifier is sent from a second computer to a first computer. As the Examiner states, the job identifier is merely combined with the user ID to obtain a job status.

Moreover, Kanematsu et al. does not disclose or suggest when the first computer determines upon the inquiring that the second identifier corresponding to the processing has not been sent due to a failure, sending by the first computer the first identifier corresponding to the processing to the second computer, or when the second identifier corresponding to the said first identifier is stored in the second

computer, sending by the second computer the second identifier to the first computer and inquiring, by the first computer to the second computer of a status of the processing using the set second identifier, as recited in the claims of the present application. Kanematsu et al. does not disclose or suggest a first computer determining whether a second identifier corresponding to the processing has not been sent due to a failure, or sending a first identifier in response to this determination to the second computer. Further, Kanematsu et al. does not disclose or suggest sending a second identifier by the second computer to the first computer when the second identifier is stored in the second computer, or inquiring by the first computer to the second computer of a status of the processing using the sent second identifier.

Regarding claim 26, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 19 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that Kanematsu et al. does not disclose or suggest where when the first computer requests the second computer to perform the processing, information regarding a notification destination is specified to which the second computer notifies a status of the processing.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Kanematsu et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 19, 21, 26 and 37 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 20, 22, 23, 27, 32 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al. in view of Matsumoto et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Matsumoto et al. discloses an inquiry type remote procedure processor where a procedure request device executing the remote procedure processing within a client system is provided with an output queue controller temporarily storing identification data, a request identification data generator generating identification data, a remote procedure execution device performing a transmission and a reception with a procedure execution device and a collection reception device taking identification data from the output queue controller and passing it to the remote procedure execution device. The procedure execution device executing the remote procedure processing within a server system is provided with a remote procedure executing device performing a transmission and a reception with the procedure request device, a request collection device performing the collection command of the request of the remote procedure processing so far as a disconnection instruction is not given, an output queue controller and a monitoring device.

Regarding claim 20, Applicants submit that neither Kanematsu et al. nor Matsumoto et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim 20, inter alia, a client computer that includes a first identifier generating section for generating a first identifier corresponding to a processing for which an inquiry is issued to a server

computer, or a server computer that includes a receiving section for receiving the first identifier and an information acquiring section for acquiring, in response to a status inquiry for the processing received from the client computer, information regarding a status of the processing corresponding to the first identifier, or a second identifier generating section for generating a second identifier corresponding to the processing and storing in the server computer the second identifier corresponding to the first identifier, or wherein the first computer, in response to a determination that the second identifier corresponding to the processing has not been sent due to a failure upon the inquiring, sends the first identifier corresponding to said processing to the second computer; the second computer, in response to the second identifier, corresponding to the sent first identifier, being stored in the second computer, sends said second identifier to the first computer; and the first computer inquires the second computer of a status of said processing using the sent second identifier. Applicants have previously discussed the deficiencies of Kanematsu et al. as failing to disclose the limitations in the claims of the present application. Moreover, Matsumoto et al. also fails to disclose these limitations and overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kanematsu et al. The Examiner admits that Kanematsu et al. fails to disclose or suggest generating a first identifier but asserts that Matsumoto et al. discloses this limitation at paragraph 14, lines 1-4 and paragraph 18, lines 8-12. However, these portions of Matsumoto et al. merely disclose a demand stereo publishes a remote procedure processing demand by the first configuration of the above, the identifier corresponding to a demand being

generated by demand identifier generation equipment, it is returned to a demand stereo, and the temporary storage of the demand is carried out into output queue management equipment with an identifier. These portions of Matsumoto et al. do not relate at all to a processing status inquiry status for inquiring a status of processing executed by another computer, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions do not disclose or suggest a first identifier generating section for generating a first identifier corresponding to a processing which an inquiry is issued to a server computer.

Regarding claims 20, 23, 27, 32 and 33, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 19, 20 and 21 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the first computer generates the first identifier and stores the first identifier on a hard disk connected thereto, or where at least one of the first identifier and the processing includes information unique to the first computer.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 20, 22, 23, 27, 32 and 33 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 24, 28, 34 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al., Matsumoto et al. and Silva et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Silva et al. discloses a communications protocol for an automated testing system which governs the generation and transmission of data packets and the automated testing system and between the components of the automated testing system.

Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 19, 20, 21 and 37 and, therefore, are patentable for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Silva et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kanematsu et al. and Matsumoto et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the unique information is an Internet protocol address of the first computer or where the unique information is an Internet protocol address of the client computer.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 24, 28, 34 and 38. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 25, 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al. in view of Coward. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Coward discloses methods and apparatus for facilitating communication among a plurality of devices during a process being performed on a remotely located server. A broker is provided that is adapted for receiving and storing information associated with the process and capable of sending at least some of the information to selected ones of the devices.

Applicants submit that claims 25, 35 and 36 are dependent on one of independent claims 19 and 21 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Coward does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kanematsu et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the first computer requests the second computer to perform the processing, information regarding a status of the processing is specified to which the second computer notifies the status of the processing even without any inquiry from the first computer, or where the first computer requests the second computer to perform the processing, information regarding a notification destination is specified to which the second computer notifies a status of the processing.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 25, 35 and 36 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al., Matsumoto et al. and Coward. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that claims 29 and 30 are dependent on independent claim 20 and, therefore, are patentable for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Coward does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kanematsu et al. and Matsumoto et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the transmitting section of the server computer sends the status of the processing to the client computer, if the status has been changed, or where the server computer also includes a storage means for storing, if the status has been changed, the status of the processing to be transmitted to the client computer.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 29 and 30 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanematsu et al., Matsumoto et al. and Coward in view of Dodd. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Dodd discloses methods, systems and articles that provide the ability for an online gift recipient to accept or exchange an online gift prior to shipping the gift to

the recipient. A gift giver accesses a gift server over a network using conventional browser software over a user node of a network. While online with the gift server node, the gift giver selects an online gift for the recipient from a variety of gifts supplied from one or more gift vendors. The recipient connects online to the gift server node, reads the gift selection information and determines whether to accept or exchange the gift.

Applicants submit that claim 31 is dependent on independent claim 20 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Dodd does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kanematsu et al. and Matsumoto et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the server computer is an order receiving computer in an electronic commerce system.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 31 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 19-38 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/744,020

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.39441X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 684-1120